

include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled Extension of Remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding adjournment of the House until Monday, February 26, 1996, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1996

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 28, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE NATION'S BUSINESS HAS NOT BEEN TAKEN CARE OF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, and what few Members are left, here we go again. It is interesting to see how this House has been run. We have not done very much. We took all last year, we ended up doing less than what they have done all the way back to 1933. We have not really done the Nation's businesses.

We have never appropriated now two, I guess, the D.C. appropriation bill has finally been passed but there is still one hanging over in the Senate. We had to appropriate the money for the foreign affairs by continuing resolution.

Now we have all run home. I do not know what for. I do not know why everybody is going home. I am not. I am staying, and I will be honest. If my colleagues want to do something tomorrow,

I will be here tomorrow. If my colleagues want to do something next Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, anytime next week, I can be here. The following week? I could be here.

We have to run off. And my farmers back home and all over this Nation, especially in the South, there is a great deal of uncertainty about what kind of program they are going to have or even if they are going to have a program. To be honest with my colleagues, the way the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman thereof and the Members of the majority have decided to go, there is not going to be a program. The bill that came out of that committee, if that is the bill that goes to the President, is going to be vetoed. It has already been vetoed once. It will be vetoed again.

Now if my colleagues want to wait until March or sometime to find out that we really have not done anything, so be it. There is nothing I can do about that. I am not in control. I am not in the majority.

I do not know why the Members voted to adjourn until February 26. We could easily do a farm bill next week. Now, in 1977, when we had a farm bill, we had it under an open rule and it took about 4 days to do it. In 1981, when we did a farm bill, we had an open rule, and it took about 3½ to 4 days to do. In 1985 it took about a week, 5 days to do it. In 1990, 3 days to do it again.

But the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture we presently have has requested an almost completely closed rule.

□ 2030

One amendment in the nature of a substitute, one motion to recommit, that is it. Everybody else, shut up. In other words, I, who come from a rural district and have a lot of farmers, have some ideas about agriculture, but have no opportunity on this floor at all to offer even one amendment.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Did the gentleman ask for an amendment to the bill in the meeting the other day? I missed it. Did the gentleman offer an amendment the other day?

Mr. VOLKMER. I sure did, to get rid of the three-entity rule. The one that permits—it is my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has the time.

Mr. VOLKMER. I offered an amendment to get rid of the three-entity rule, the one that under that bill gives the big cotton farmer down in Texas and other places, and some of the rice farmers, \$80,000 a year, folks, for 7 years. They do not even have to farm. I do not think that is right.

I do not think we need welfare in agriculture. My farmers do not want freedom to farm or freedom not to farm. My farmers, even the best, and I just

talked to one again yesterday, he has been very active in Missouri. It does not take a position on this farm bill of yours. I do not know of many farmers in my area of northern Missouri that do.

They do not want to be paid by the Government. They want money from the marketplace. That is where they want their money. Yet you want to give them money every year; even if they make 1 million bucks, or if they make \$100,000, you want to give them money. They do not want your money under those circumstances.

They will be willing to take the money if the times are bad and they need it and prices are low; then, yes, they would like to have a little help to get through. I am willing to give them that help. But I do not think it is right to give major corporations in this country, major corporations, \$80,000 a year, even if they make a half a million on their farm operations.

At the same time, you are cutting back on all other programs, and the biggest thing out of this whole farm bill mess, the biggest thing out of this mess, what they are doing on the majority side is they are cutting \$13 billion in the next 7 years out of agriculture, \$13 billion out of agriculture. Why? So they can give their wealthy friends a big tax break. It is all part of the tax-break money.

It is not necessary. If you looked at the Democratic coalition budget, you do not have to make that cut in agriculture. We do not have to do that.

Let us stay here next week and do a farm bill, a good farm bill, and not the lousy freedom not to farm. You do not have to farm to get your payment, folks.

#### 1999 WOMEN'S WORLD CUP TOURNAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to support the continued growth of women's sports in general, and of women's soccer in particular, I, along with 37 House colleagues, have introduced a resolution recognizing and supporting the efforts of the U.S. Soccer Federation in bringing the 1999 Women's World Cup tournament to the United States.

Recent evidence demonstrates that there is unprecedented interest in the sport of soccer in the United States—the 1994 men's games had the highest attendance and the largest viewership of any World Cup ever. On the heels of this success, the U.S. Soccer Federation has resolved to submit a formal bid to the Federation Internationale de Football Association [FIFA] to host the 1999 Women's World Cup.

The Women's World Cup tournament, like the men's, is hosted every 4 years by a different country. It is considered the most important women's soccer